

REMARKS

This Amendment is fully responsive to the non-final Office Action dated June 9, 2010, issued in connection with the above-identified application. Claims 22, 23, 26 and 31-38 are pending in the present application. With this Amendment, claims 22, 23, 26 and 38 have been amended. No new matter has been introduced by the amendments made to the claims. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 22, 23, 26 and 38 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 for not falling within one of the four statutory categories of patentable subject matter. With regard to claims 22, 23 and 26, the Examiner alleges that the claims are directed to software modules so the claims are *per se* software and not statutory. With regard to claim 38, the Examiner alleges that the claim recites a series of steps that: (1) must be tied to a particular machine; or (2) transform underlying subject matter to a different state or thing.

The Applicants have amended independent claims 22, 23, 26 and 38 to add additional structure to the claims. Independent claims 22, 23 and 26 have each been amended to recite “at least one processor configured to operate as:” (followed by the different units recited in the claims). Additionally, claim 38 has been amended to recite “converting, via at least one processor, the common private information into first conversion information according to a predetermined conversion.”

As noted in the Applicants’ disclosure, the server 20 is a computer system including a microprocessor, a ROM, a RAM, a hard disk unit, and a display unit (see Figs. 1 and 2; and pg. 37, lines 14-20). Accordingly, as amended, independent claims 22, 23 and 26 include sufficient structure to fall within one of the four statutory categories of patentable subject matter within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. 101. Additionally, independent claim 38 has been amended to tie at least one step in the claim (i.e., the “converting” step) to a particular machine.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection to claims 22, 23, 26 and 38 under 35 U.S.C. 101 is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 31-37 have been objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim. Claims 31-37 depend respectively from independent claims 23, 26 and 31. Independent claims 23, 26 and 31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101, and no prior art rejections were made to independent claims 23, 26 and 31. As noted above, independent claims 23, 26 and 31 have been amended to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 101. Accordingly, claims 31-

37 should now be in condition for allowance by virtue of their respective dependencies from independent claims 23, 26 and 31 (as amended). Withdrawal of the objection to claims 31-37 is respectfully requested.

No prior art rejections were noted in the Office Action.

In light of the above, the Applicants submit that all the pending claims are patentable over the prior art of record. The Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejections presented in the outstanding Office Action, and pass the present application to issue. Additionally, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney by telephone to resolve any remaining issues in the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

Yuichi FUTA et al.

By /Mark D. Pratt/
2010.09.08 14:28:24 -04'00'

Mark D. Pratt
Registration No. 45,794
Attorney for Applicants

MDP/clw
Washington, D.C. 20005-1503
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
September 8, 2010